

REMARKS

The present application was filed on November 26, 2003 with claims 1-30. Claims 1, 11, 20, 25, 29 and 30 are the independent claims.

In the outstanding Office Action dated September 26, 2005, the Examiner: (i) objected to the disclosure at page 8; (ii) objected to the drawings; (iii) objected to claim 29 under 35 C.F.R. 1.75(a); (iv) rejected claims 1-24 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph; and (v) allowed claims 25-28.

Applicants sincerely appreciate the indication of allowable subject matter.

Regarding the objection to the disclosure at page 8, Applicants have amended the paragraph as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Regarding the objection to the drawings, Applicants provide herewith replacement sheets with the changes as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Regarding the objection to claim 29, Applicants have amended claim 29 as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Regarding the §112, second paragraph, rejections of claims 1-24 and 30, Applicants have amended the independent claims and certain of the dependent claims to address the questions raised by the Examiner. Applicants believe that the amendments make clear the functions performed by the surveillance system and which features of the surveillance system perform those functions. By way of illustration only, it is also to be noted that the components in FIG. 2 are components of an illustrative surveillance system of the invention. This example may assist the Examiner in seeing one possible embodiment to which the independent claims are more broadly directed.

Regarding the phrase “likelihood of harm” and the question of who or what is being harmed, Applicants respectfully point out that the present specification at page 4, lines 14-30, gives example scenarios of who or what could be harmed. For example, if a certain person is detected in an area, a pre-emptive action such as a computer backup may be performed so that data on the computer is not lost if the person tampers with the computer. In another example, the harm might be to the well-being of the detected person who enters the monitored area. As explained in the specification, the

Attorney Docket No. YOR920030552US1

invention is not limited to a particular person or thing being harmed. Thus, the claim language is intended not to be limited to a particular illustrative scenario.

Certainly, if there are any other questions or concerns, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney to discuss.

In view of the above, Applicants believe that claims 1-30 are in condition for allowance, and respectfully request withdrawal of the §112 rejection.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: January 26, 2006

William E. Lewis
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 39,274
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
90 Forest Avenue
Locust Valley, NY 11560
(516) 759-2946